



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE REAL AND THE IDEAL IN THE PAPACY.

BY PROFESSOR CHARLES AUGUSTUS BRIGGS, D.D., D.LITT.

THE Papacy is one of the greatest institutions that have ever existed in the world; it is much the greatest now existing, and it looks forward with calm assurance to a still greater future. Its dominion extends throughout the world over the only oecumenical church. All other churches are national or provincial in their organization. It reaches back in unbroken succession through more than eighteen centuries to St. Peter, appointed by the Saviour of the world to be the Primate of the Apostles. It commands the great central body of Christianity, which has ever remained the same organism since Apostolic times. All other Christian organizations, however separate they may be from the parent stock, have their share in the Papacy as a part of the Christian heritage and are regarded by the Papacy as subject to its jurisdiction. The authority of the Papacy is recognized as supreme in all ecclesiastical affairs, by the most compact and best-organized body of mankind, and as infallible in determination of doctrines of faith and morals when it speaks *ex cathedra*.

The history of the Papacy has been a history of storm and conflict. About it have raged for centuries the greatest battles in all history. The gates of Hell have been open in Rome, if anywhere in this world. At times it seemed as if Hell had emptied itself in Rome, and, to use the language of the *Apocalypse*, it were become "a habitation of devils and a hold of every unclean spirit" (Rev. xviii, 2). It is not strange that zealous Protestants, when they looked at the abominations that enveloped the Papacy in their times, saw in it the "woman sitting upon a scarlet-colored beast, full of names of blasphemy," and regarded it as "the mother of harlots and of the abominations of the earth" (Rev. xvii, 3-5). And yet these forces of evil have

always been driven back. When the conflict has subsided the Papacy has stood forth stronger than ever. If zealous Protestants, in their antipathy to the Papacy, picture it in all the imagery of the Biblical Anti-Christ, can we blame the defenders of the Papacy from applying to it the words of Jesus to St. Peter? Is there not historic truth in saying, "The gates of hell have not prevailed against it"? Are not the words of Jesus to St. Peter equally appropriate to his successors? "Simon, Simon, behold, Satan asked to have you, that he might sift you as wheat, but I made supplication for thee, that thy faith fail not: and do thou when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren" (Luke xxii, 31, 32).

The Papacy has a much firmer basis in a number of texts of the New Testament and in Christian history than most Protestants have been willing to recognize. There can be no doubt that Roman Catholic controversialists have warped the meaning of several passages of the New Testament in the interest of the most exaggerated claims for the Papacy. But, on the other hand, Protestant controversialists have minimized the importance of these texts and emptied them of their true meaning. Jesus, in His vision of His Kingdom, when St. Peter recognized Him as the Messiah, said (Matt. xvi, 17-19):

"Blessed art thou, Simon, son of Jonah,
For flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee,
But my Father which is in heaven;
And I say unto thee: Thou art Peter,
And upon this rock will I build my church,
And the gates of Hell shall not prevail against it.
I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of God.
And whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven,
And whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."

All attempts to explain the "rock" in any other way than as referring to Peter have ignominiously failed. As I have said elsewhere:

"St. Peter was thus made by the appointment of Jesus the rock on which the Church was built as a spiritual house, or temple; and at the same time the porter of the kingdom, whose privilege it is to open and shut its gates. The Church is here conceived as a building, a house, constituted of living stones, all built upon Peter, the first of these stones, or the primary rock foundation. It is also conceived as a city of God, into which men enter by the gates. These conceptions are familiar in

the Old Testament, as well as in the New Testament. The significant thing here is the primacy of St. Peter. He is chief of the Twelve, who elsewhere in the New Testament are conceived as the twelve foundations of the temple and city of God. He is the chief porter, as elsewhere the Twelve have the authority of the keys, and the Church has it, as an assembly of Christians. Jesus gave them authority to admit into His kingdom, or to exclude therefrom.”*

This saying of Jesus is confirmed by the history of the Apostolic age. Peter was certainly the chief of the Apostles, according to all the Gospels, during the earthly life of our Lord. The early chapters of “Acts” represent him as the acknowledged chief of the Apostolic community down to the Council at Jerusalem. If we had the continuation of the narrative of St. Peter’s work in Antioch, western Asia and finally in Rome, in all probability the same undisputed leadership would appear. But the last half of the book of “Acts” follows the career of St. Paul, based on the narrative of one of his companions, probably Titus, and naturally St. Paul is the hero of that narrative. Furthermore, St. Paul’s work is illustrated by his Epistles, which assume a most prominent position in the New Testament. It is very common among those who follow the Lutheran tradition, which makes the Epistle to the Galatians the test of the genuine theology of St. Paul and the key to Apostolic Christianity, to deprecate St. Peter in comparison with St. Paul. But, in fact, the Council of Jerusalem decided for St. Peter, and St. Paul himself abandoned his earlier unflinching adherence to theory in favor of the Christian expediency of St. Peter, in all of his subsequent life, as is evident from his own later Epistles and from the story of the companion of his travels. It has been established by modern historic criticism that the Church of the second century did not build on St. Paul, but rather on the Gospels and, presumably, on St. Peter. Harnack puts it in the form of an Irish bull when he says: “Only one Gentile Christian, Marcion, understood St. Paul, and he misunderstood him.”

It is evident that Jesus, in speaking to St. Peter, had the whole history of His Kingdom in view. He sees conflict with the evil powers and victory over them. It is, therefore, vain to suppose that we must limit the commission to St. Peter. We could no more do that than we could limit the Apostolic commission to the Apostles. The commission of the primate, no less than the

* “Ethical Teaching of Jesus,” p. 277.

commission of the Twelve, includes their successors in all time to the end of the world. The natural interpretation of the passage, therefore, apart from all prejudice, gives the Papacy a basal authority, as it has always maintained. Therefore we must admit that there must be a sense in which the successors of St. Peter are the rock of the Church, and have the authority of the keys in ecclesiastical government, discipline and determination of faith and morals. Inasmuch, however, as the commission is given to the Twelve and their successors also as to the power of the keys, it is necessary to take the several passages together, and conclude that the authority was given by our Lord to the Apostles in a body, and that it was given to St. Peter as the executive head of the body.

There are two other passages upon which the Papacy builds its authority. The chief of these is John xxi, where Peter is singled out from the seven who were with Jesus on the shore of the Sea of Galilee after his resurrection, and the command was given to Peter to "feed the sheep." Here Jesus appoints St. Peter to be the shepherd of the flock of Christ, which, in accordance with the usage of the time with reference to the kings of David's line, and with reference to Christ Himself as the Good Shepherd, implies government of the Church. It is all the more significant that this passage singles out and distinguishes Peter in the presence of the sons of Zebedee and others, the most prominent of the Twelve, and that the narrative is contained in the Gospel of John. Here again it cannot be supposed that this is a commission to St. Peter as an individual. He is given an office as the chief shepherd of the flock of Christ. If the flock continues, the chief shepherd must be the successor of St. Peter, to carry on his work as shepherd. The third passage is given in Luke xxii, 31, 32, mentioned above. None of these passages is in the Gospel of Mark, which represents the preaching of St. Peter as nearly as we can come to it; but in the other three Gospels, Matthew from Palestine or Syria, John from Asia Minor, and Luke from a disciple of St. Paul. They may well, therefore, represent the consensus of the Apostolic Church. These three words of Jesus to St. Peter were all uttered on the most solemn and critical occasions in the life of our Lord. They may all be regarded, therefore, as visions of our Lord, visions of His Kingdom and ideals of the Papacy.

I cannot undertake to give even a sketch of the history of the Papacy. We shall have to admit that the Christian Church from the earliest times recognized the primacy of the Roman bishop; and that all the other great Sees at times recognized the supreme jurisdiction of Rome in matters of doctrine, government and discipline. It can easily be shown that the assumptions of the bishops of Rome were often resented, their intrusions into the rights of other patriarchates, provinces and dioceses were often resisted, their decisions were often refused; but, when the whole case has been carefully examined and all the evidences sifted, the statement of Irenæus stands firm:

“ Since, however, it would be very tedious, in such a volume as this, to reckon up the successions of all the churches, we do put to confusion all those who, in whatever manner, whether by an evil self-pleasing, by vainglory or by blindness or perverse opinion, assemble in unauthorized meetings; (we do this, I say) by indicating that tradition derived from the Apostles, of the very great, the very ancient, and universally known Church, founded and organized at Rome by the two most glorious Apostles, Peter and Paul; as also (by pointing out) the faith preached to men, which comes down to our time by means of the succession of the bishops. For it is a matter of necessity that every church should agree with this church on account of its preeminent authority, that is, the faithful everywhere, inasmuch as the Apostolic tradition has been preserved continuously by those (faithful men) who exist everywhere.”

The historical development of the Papacy is one of the most stupendous series of events in history. Throughout the greater part of its history, until the Reformation, the Papacy represented the cause of the Christian people against emperor, kings and princelets. It was the saviour of Christian civilization from heathen barbarism. But towards the close of the Middle Ages, owing to its entanglement with political affairs and the exaggeration of its civil interests over against its ecclesiastical, the Papacy so stretched its prerogatives as to become a peril to the states of Europe, where absolutism had to be resisted at all costs in the interests of humanity and even of Christianity itself. After many ineffectual attempts to reform the Papacy by Christian Councils and movements of various kinds that had resulted in wide-spread and well-nigh universal dissatisfaction, Luther applied the match, and Europe was aflame in resistance to the unholy despotism of the Popes. Few, if any, thought of over-

throwing the jurisdiction of the Papacy in ecclesiastical affairs, but they were determined to rid themselves of its despotism in all other affairs. But the inevitable result of the conflict was the repudiation by Protestantism of the jurisdiction of the Pope altogether. It was found that the ecclesiastical and the civil were so inextricably interwoven, at the time, that the whole fabric had to be cast off.

The Protestant Reformation was essentially a Protest, and so it might always have remained, a protest against Papal usurpation, with a willingness to recognize all valid, historical and Biblical rights of the Pope. But, by the irresistible force of circumstances, Protestantism was compelled to go further and organize itself in National Churches, entirely apart from any jurisdiction of the Pope. So far as there was a historical necessity for this course, it was valid. But when, later, Protestants went so far as to deny all the historic rights of the Papacy, Protestantism put itself in a false position which must ultimately be abandoned. In the mean time the Papacy has been obliged gradually to reform itself. The Council of Trent was a reforming Council, and there has been a slow, cautious, but steady advance in reform ever since. Catholics and Protestants all over the world are looking with hope and eagerness for great and wide-spread reforms, such as may remove the evils that brought about the division of the Church, and destroy the barriers which perpetuate the separation; and, in a spirit of love and concord, rally the entire Christian world about Christ our Lord and a successor of St. Peter who will be as near to Christ as St. Peter was, and as truly a representative of the Lord and Master as Shepherd of the flock of Christ, the executive head of a reunited Christianity. Is there in the Papacy as at present constituted any hope for the future? Can we see any prospects for such reforms as are necessary to reunion?

(1) The unity of the Church is in Christ, the head of the entire body of Christians. Such a Christianity embraces the world of the living and the dead, those in various stages of preparation, as well as those already Christian. Christianity in the world is organized in one Church, under the Apostolic ministry, culminating in the Universal Bishop, the successor of St. Peter. The three constituents necessary to complete unity are the Pope, the ministry and the people, a threefold cord which should not

be broken. The unity of the Church is not in the person of the Pope, but in his office, as the Universal Bishop, and as such the head of all the bishops, as these are of the ministers and people. In Christian history, the unity of the ministry has been expressed in *Ecumenical Councils*, that of the people in their lawful civil governments. Any failure to recognize and give due weight to each and all of these constituents of unity impairs the unity of the Church, but does not destroy it, so long as even one of the lines remains unbroken.

(2) The Pope, as the successor of St. Peter, is the executive head of the Church. But that which is essential to his office and the exercise of its functions should be distinguished from what is unessential and unnecessary. The primacy is independent of national or circumstantial relations. It is not necessary that the successor of St. Peter should be Italian or Roman. St. Peter was not a Roman, but a Jew of Palestine. The Popes have been, in fact, chiefly Roman or Italian, except for the periods of the supremacy of the German Empire, when there was a series of German Popes, and the supremacy of France and the residence of the Popes at Avignon, when there was a series of French Popes. This is a provincialization or nationalization of the Papacy, and is a serious hindrance to its universality. However important it may be, for historical reasons, that the successor of St. Peter should have his seat in Rome, it is not essential. St. Peter was primate before he went to Rome. His residence in Rome was brief, and there is no evidence that he would have remained permanently in Rome if he had lived. The residence of the Popes at Avignon for a long period makes this position necessary, otherwise the succession would be broken. It is not essential that the successor of St. Peter should be bishop of Rome. There is no sufficient evidence that he was ever bishop of Rome, or that Rome had a bishop in Apostolic times. The combination of a universal episcopate with a diocesan episcopate, however necessary in early times, has been productive of a multitude of evils. The Roman people have ever made claims in their choice of their own bishops which, while entirely appropriate to a diocesan bishop, could not be recognized as valid to a universal bishop, and were intolerable to other cities and nations. The interests of the city of Rome have ever been exaggerated at the expense of other cities and nations. This has tended to make the Papacy

metropolitan and provincial, rather than universal. The efforts of the great Popes to do justice to their universal episcopate have kept them in constant strife with Rome and Italy until the present day. If in some way the office of the primate could be separated from diocesan, provincial and national episcopates and limited to œcumeneal duties, a multitude of evils would be overcome.

(3) The primacy of the Pope does not depend upon any particular theory as to the extent of his jurisdiction. This has varied from age to age. The theory of the primacy of the Pope which prevailed in the ancient Catholic Church must be regarded as sufficient to maintain the unity of the Church in the Papacy, otherwise this unity did not then exist and cannot be derived by succession from the Apostles. The theory of the Papacy which now prevails in the Roman Catholic Church may be regarded as a development of the original definition of the primacy, but cannot be regarded as essential to its existence. Those who hold to the primacy of the Pope in the ancient Catholic sense cannot be regarded as violating the unity of the Church in the Papacy, because they refuse to regard this late development as valid. If the Papacy of to-day makes it impossible for them to take part actively in this unity, the Papacy itself is to blame.

The primacy of the Pope was recognized in the ancient Catholic Church even by Churches which were compelled to separate from Rome by unrighteous and intolerable tyranny of the Popes. The chief fault was with the Popes, who strained the lines of jurisdiction so far that they broke. If these faults of Rome should ever be reduced to a minimum, there is no sufficient reason why the separation should continue because of ancient faults. The slender thread of a recognized primacy, latent and inoperative, is still sufficient to maintain the essential unity of the Church.

The primacy of the Pope was recognized by the Protestant Reformers, who appealed from a Pope ill informed to a Pope well informed. They receded from the position only when expelled from the Roman Catholic Church, and when such a position became no longer practicable. Theoretically, Protestantism still remains Protestant, protesting against the excessive claims of the Papacy and willing to recognize its legitimate claims. When the jurisdiction of the Papacy is reduced to its

normal dimensions, there will remain no sufficient reason for the separation of the Protestant Churches, provided other obstacles have been removed.

(4) The primacy of the Popes does not depend upon any particular theory as to the subject-matter of their jurisdiction. That has varied from time to time, and only the Catholic essentials can be rightly demanded. The claims of the Papacy to jurisdiction in civil affairs and to dominion over civic governments have been justly refused by the nations at the expense of many wars, and are no longer of any practical importance. Even in the mild forms of mediation for peace, it has recently been rejected with unanimity by the nations at the Conference at The Hague. Such claims are against the express teaching of Jesus and His Apostles, and the practice of the ancient Catholic Church.

The claims of the Papacy to a Papal domain in the former States of the Church and the city of Rome have been rejected by the people of those States and the city of Rome itself. Whatever historic necessity there may have been for so extensive a civil dominion in the past, at present such an extended civil jurisdiction is impracticable and of no real importance. The Papacy must have a territory in which it may carry on the government of the Church throughout the world outside the jurisdiction of any particular civil government. But a very limited territory, such as the American District of Columbia, would be amply sufficient for that purpose.

The claim of the Papacy to determine questions of civil government for Roman Catholic citizens is resisted by modern peoples, and must be eventually withdrawn. Whether the attempt is made to influence the governments by representatives of the Papacy, as in Austria and Spain, or by the organization of Catholic parties for the maintenance of so-called Catholic principles, as in Germany, they intensify political strife by religious interests, they mix politics and religion, they provoke religious conflicts, and are demoralizing to the Roman Catholic Church itself.

The sad results of such Papal interference are now disturbing the great French nation. Whatever faults there may have been on the part of the French government, it was in fact defending itself against Papal interference, and it is not surprising that

the defence was at last transformed into an aggressive campaign, in the determination to get rid of the enemy once for all, and at all hazards. In such a conflict, it is vain for the Papacy to assert the divine constitution of the Church, for that divine constitution has nothing whatever to do with civil jurisdiction or rights of property.

The claims of the Papacy to determine questions of Science and Philosophy, of Sociology and Economics are resented and resisted by scholars and people interested in these matters. The syllabus of Pius IX was just such an intrusion of Papal jurisdiction, which has injured the influence of the Roman Catholic Church to a very great extent and has been productive of great mischief. The proposed issue of another syllabus by Pius X is a reactionary policy, which if carried out can only greatly imperil the influence of the Papacy upon the present generation. The continual inscribing on the Index of many of the best works of modern scholars, even those of devout Roman Catholics, is resented by scholars of all faiths. The recent decisions of the Papal Commission, under the lead of incompetent divines, against the sure results of modern criticism, present clear evidence of the intolerance of modern Roman scholasticism.

The claims of the Popes to determine social questions, such as marriage and divorce and public education, in their civil relations, have been resisted in all free countries, and have resulted in civil marriage and divorce, and in public schools without religious instruction. There can be no question of the right of the Pope to determine all ecclesiastical questions as regards marriage and divorce for Roman Catholic citizens, and to fortify ecclesiastical opinions by ecclesiastical penalties; or of the right of Roman Catholic citizens to organize parochial schools with religious instruction after their own mind; but any interference by the Pope directly or indirectly with such questions when under debate by modern governments cannot be less than a misuse of Papal jurisdiction.

(5) The jurisdiction of the Pope should be defined and limited by a constitution, as the executive office has been in all modern governments. The development of modern civil governments has been in the growth of constitutions, defining and limiting the power and jurisdiction of the executive, made necessary in order to the removal of the evils of absolutism and tyranny. The same

development is greatly needed in the Papacy for the same reasons. The Papacy is at present more absolute in its government than the Tsar of Russia or the Sultan of Turkey. It can no more be allowed to the Popes to define their own powers and the subject - matter of their jurisdiction than it can be allowed to modern monarchs. The history of the Papacy is a history of errors in this regard. The Popes have, in fact, claimed anything and everything they wished. Let them limit their jurisdiction to that which St. Peter exercised, and the world will have no quarrel with them. Constitutional definitions and restrictions are needed to restrain the Popes and their councillors, the cardinals, within their legitimate limits of jurisdiction; and also to defend the rights of the Papacy from the intrusion of civil governments. If the peril of former times was the excessive claims of the Popes, the peril at present is also the intrusion of the civil powers into ecclesiastical affairs. Such a constitution would protect the Pope in his rights as the executive head of the Church, and limit him only within his just sphere of jurisdiction.

The definition of the Vatican Council limits the sphere of the infallible authority of the Pope to faith and morals, and thereby declares fallible, though authoritative, his jurisdiction in all other matters. What is needed to make that definition more practical is to define not only the rights and liberties of the Church, but also the limits of that liberty, restraining the Church from interference with the States, and modern learning, and social and economical affairs, as well as restraining the States from interference with ecclesiastical affairs.

(6) The Primacy of the Pope is not apart from the Apostolic ministry but in union with it. The Orientals hold to the Ecumenical Councils and their supremacy, and maintain their unity through them. The subjugation of Oriental Christianity, with the exception of Russia, by Mohammedanism, has rendered it impracticable for the Orientals to engage in General Councils in modern times. The Roman Catholic Church, after the separation of the Orientals, continued to hold Ecumenical Councils down to the present time, twenty-two in all; but inasmuch as these Councils were limited to bishops, doctors and heads of Orders, in subjection to Rome, and excluded, especially since the Protestant Reformation, the representatives of the majority of Christian and Orthodox Churches, they are not regarded as ecumenical, except by

the Roman Catholic Church itself. Protestants demanded an Ecumenical Council to reform the Church and settle the great problems and controversies of Christianity. The Council of Trent, which excluded them, and all others except those who submitted to the Pope, they could not recognize as truly œcumeneical. Protestantism still demands an Ecumenical Council; and, so far as is practicable through international alliances and conventions and assemblies of various denominations, is striving to realize it. Those Christian Churches which recognize the unity of the Church in Ecumenical Councils adhere to those of the early Church, which were truly œcumeneical, and long for such in the present time, to remove the distractions of Christianity, and hold to this line of unity so far as practicable—they are not so much to blame for the perpetuation of discord in the Church as those who make such Councils impossible.

The Roman Catholic Church has reduced the bishops to submission under the absolute dominion of the Pope. The overruling of the Councils of the episcopate of France on several recent occasions by the Pope, and their humble submission to his will, constitute one of the most melancholy situations in the history of Christianity. There is no other provision for a General Council of bishops than the desire, or need, of the Pope to convoke them. He alone determines the members of the Councils, which in any case are composed largely of bishops without jurisdiction, entirely dependent upon himself for support. If they are not sufficiently submissive, their decisions may be overruled and reversed at his will. The Vatican Council abdicated the rights of Councils in favor of the Pope. The Papacy thus deprived itself of the support of a Council at the very time when modern States, even Italy, found it necessary to establish and exalt the powers of representative bodies. A Council will not be called until needed to sustain the Pope. But it is evident that the Pope needs just such a Council and that he must call it ere long. It would not by any means injure the Primacy of the Pope if he were sustained by an episcopate meeting at regular intervals in a Council, as the Council of Constance prescribed. It would destroy his absolutism, which can only invoke passive obedience, but it would enhance his authority by giving it greatly needed support, and arouse the enthusiasm of the Church for greatly needed reforms. The Papacy should limit itself by a representa-

tive Council of Bishops, giving to such a body the legislative functions of the Church, and restricting the Papal authority to executive functions and the right of initiative and veto in legislative matters as in all modern civil governments. The usual objections made to such representative Councils are evidently insincere. They simply indicate the reluctance of Rome to have any check upon its will. The bishops are required to report to the Pope every three or five years. It would be no more difficult to gather them at regular intervals of five years in Council. Other Christian Churches find no difficulty in assembling representatives from all parts of the world.

The Cardinalate is not a representative body, and can hardly be made one, because it is essentially engaged in the executive work of the Church, as the cabinets and officials of modern States. It is chiefly Italian, and largely Roman, and as such is influenced by Roman and Italian interests, often at the sacrifice of oecumenical relations. There is a strong feeling throughout the world, and even in Rome, that the Cardinalate should be a more representative body, less Italian and Roman. It is generally said that the present Pope will gradually bring this about. But he has done nothing thus far in this direction. The reluctance in Rome to appoint American cardinals, and the eager use of any and every excuse to avoid it, are striking evidences of the desire not to give the American Catholics their just share in the government of the Church and to keep them under the dominion of Rome. In view of the fact that the cardinals are diocesan bishops of the Roman province, presbyters of Roman Churches and deacons of the Roman diocese, they are too Roman to be oecumenical in office. Furthermore, the cardinals are really the cabinet of the Pope; and it is necessary that most of them should live in Rome in order to transact the business of the Church; therefore they cannot be truly representative of other nations.

In the Protestant world, the principle of representation is much further developed than in the Roman Catholic. The synods, diocesan, provincial, national and international, represent the ministry in most Protestant Churches. The representative principle has little influence at present in the Roman Catholic world. But there is no impediment to the full recognition of that principle and its practical efficient use, if the Papacy should so determine.

(7) The third line of unity is the consent of the Christian people. This consent has been recognized from the most ancient times, but its practical operation has been suppressed by the hierarchy in the Roman Church. When the Roman Empire became Christian, the Emperor, as the supreme ruler of the Christian people, had a potent influence in determining ecclesiastical and doctrinal affairs in the West, as well as in the East. The Emperor represented the Christian people, over against the clergy, and the people thereby had in fact an exaggerated influence in the Church. The right of the Emperor was inherited by the modern nations into which the Empire was divided, and passed over from king to princes, presidents, parliaments and congresses of the people. In all State Churches, the rights of the people centre in their sovereigns in all ecclesiastical affairs. In the Free Churches, the consent of the people is expressed by their representatives sitting with the ministry in various representative assemblies.

The Roman Church has always recognized this great original Catholic principle of unity, and therefore insisted upon the union of Church and State. Centuries of struggle with the Empire and the Kings and States of Europe were necessary, because of the conflict between civil and ecclesiastical jurisdictions, in which the emperors and kings were more often at fault than even the Popes, who resisted to the utmost every restriction upon a jurisdiction which they were ever eager to enlarge. The battle of the Reformation resulted in the overthrow of the Papacy in the north of Europe, and in the definition of the rights of the nations with regard to the affairs of the Church in southern Europe, by the establishment of Concordats.

A Concordat is something more than a commercial agreement. It is nonsense to say that a nation may not annul such an agreement without the consent of the Papacy. The Pope himself violated the Concordat with France by summoning two French bishops to Rome in spite of the prohibition of the French Government. The ecclesiastical and the civil interests were irreconcilable at the time, and the Pope had to act in accordance with the spiritual interests of the Church. But if the Pope may violate the Concordat in the interests of spiritual religion, the French Government may abrogate it in the interests of civil government. The separation of Church and State in Italy and France leaves

but two important Roman Catholic States, Austria and Spain, and these will doubtless soon follow the example of France. The fear of this result doubtless influences greatly the Papacy in its resistance to the present French Government. This is probably the last desperate struggle of the Papacy for political power. Its inevitable defeat will reduce its political relations to a minimum. It will be an immeasurable blessing to the world when civil politics disappear from the Papacy altogether.

For much the greater part of the Roman Catholic world the Popes have at present no means of determining the consent of the Christian people, except by their submission to the decisions of Rome made known through the episcopate. The Papacy has absorbed unto itself the authority of Councils and of the peoples also, and so has become the most absolute despotism on earth. The future of the Papacy in the modern world depends upon the reinvigorating of the latent principle of the consent of the people through their representatives in some form of ecclesiastical Council. There are, here and there, signs of the beginning of some such movement, and there is no obstacle to it except the consent of the Papacy.

(8) The eventual reunion of Christendom depends upon the reinvigoration and harmonious working out of the three lines of unity as a threefold cord of invincible strength. So far as the Papacy is concerned, it should be constitutional, and should give adequate representation to the clergy and the people, meeting in Councils at regular intervals. The three great divisions of Christendom have only partial unity through the use of one only of the lines of unity. The Roman Church makes the Papacy the most essential principle of unity to the neglect of the Ecumenical Council and the consent of the Christian people, which remain latent principles. The Greeks make the principle of unity the Ecumenical Councils and the consent of the people in the Emperor, the real head of the Church; the executive principle of the Papacy is latent. The State Churches of Protestantism emphasize the consent of the people in the authority of kings, princes and legislative bodies. The Free Churches employ the consent of the people in representative bodies. There are no valid reasons why the Papacy in the future may not reinvigorate the Council by making it truly representative of the ministry and the people of the Christian world.

(9) In the most advanced modern States, the government distinguishes three great functions—the executive, legislative and judicial—each having its own appropriate organization. The executive function is exercised in monarchies by a king or emperor, in republics by a president. The legislative function is exercised by legislative bodies usually in two Houses, the one more directly representing the people, the other representing the nobility, or the more conservative interests. The judicial function is exercised by a bench of judges. In no Church has there been a sufficient discrimination in the development of these functions. All Churches alike are a long distance behind the civil governments in this matter. The Roman Catholic Church combines them all in the Papacy, just as in former ages they were combined in the Emperor. Protestant bodies combine all three functions, in Free Churches in national synods; in State Churches under various ecclesiastical authorities appointed by and subject to the State. The executive function is in the background even in Episcopal Churches. The judicial function is the one that is most neglected, and therefore it is always difficult to get a valid judicial decision of any important question, whether of doctrine, government, or discipline, in any of the Protestant Churches. There is no adequate training of the clergy in Canon Law, and they are therefore as a body altogether unfitted to sit as jurors or judges. The transformation of Church government into full accord with modern civil government would be a most important step towards the restoration of the full unity of the Church.

(10) There are no serious barriers in the way of such a transformation of the Papacy as may remove the chief objections of those Churches which do not at present recognize its supreme jurisdiction. The great principle of unity of Greek and Oriental Churches may become operative in Ecumenical Councils truly representing the entire Christian world. Such Councils may by their decisions so supplement, enlarge and improve the past decisions of the Roman Catholic Church and Popes that the objections to them may be removed and the entire world may accept the results. The infallible and irreformable determinations of Councils and Popes are few, and these may be so explained, limited or enlarged, and the essential so discriminated from the unessential, that even these discriminations may no longer be stumbling-blocks to the world. The great principle of Protestant

Christianity, the consent of the Christian people, may become operative in the introduction of representatives of the people into the presbyterial and synodical system of the Church. The bureaucracy of the Cardinalate and the Congregations at Rome may be reduced to the efficient system in use in all modern representative governments. The absolutism of the Pope may be destroyed by a constitution defining carefully the limitation and extent of his powers. The government of the Pope may be fortified and at the same time limited by a Council meeting every three or five years, representing the entire Christian world. The legislative function of the Papacy may be eliminated from the executive, as in the best modern States. The judicial function of the Papacy may be separated by the organism of a supreme court of Christendom. There is nothing in any infallible decision of Councils and Popes that in any way prevents some such transformation of the Papacy as is here conceived of. This ideal may be in its details an illusion—doubtless most will think it such—but whether the outlines of this ideal and its details be mistaken in whole or in part, it is certain, as Jesus Christ our Saviour reigns over His Church and the world, that some day, in some way, the Papacy will be reformed so as to correspond with His ideal, and will be so transformed as to make it the executive head of a universal Church.

CHARLES AUGUSTUS BRIGGS.